

#### REMARKS

The title of the specification has been amended in accordance with the examiner's suggestion.

The examiner has rejected claim 28 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicant has amended claim 28 and it is believed that all claims of record comply with the definiteness requirement of 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

The examiner has rejected claims 22-27, 30-33 and 38-42 under 35 USC 102 over Bruhin and has rejected claims 29 and 34-37 under 35 USC 103 employing Bruhin as the primary reference.

Claim 22 is directed to a portable cleaning assembly and recites an elongate body, a carriage member movable in a reciprocal manner along a required proportion of the body, and a cleaning member mounted on the carriage for cleaning an item. Claim 22 further recites a first engagement member engageable with an item to be cleaned towards a first side of the item, and a second engagement member engageable with the item towards an opposite side thereof. The second engagement member is adjustably mounted on the elongate body so as to be provided at a required spacing from the first engagement member for a particular width of item to be cleaned. The carriage member is movable along a required proportion of the body between the first and second engagement members.

The examiner evidently considers that the jet head 5 of Bruhin, which is used to clean the surface 10 of an escalator or moving walkway, is an apt counterpart for the elongate body recited in claim 22 and that the brackets 15, which engage the high sidewalls 17, are apt counterparts for the first and second engagement members recited in claim 22.

The examiner's discussion of the disclosure of Bruhin does not refer to a cleaning member. Applicant believes that the closest counterpart in Bruhin to the cleaning member recited in claim 22 is the jet head 5, and that the closest counterpart to the elongate body recited in claim 22 is not the jet head 5, as suggested by the examiner, but is the "longitudinal section" 14, which appears to

include the guide rails 18. Applicant therefore submits that the examiner's interpretation of Bruhin is incorrect.

As noted above, claim 22 requires that the second engagement member is adjustably mounted on the elongate body so as to be provided at a required spacing from the first engagement member for a particular width of item to be cleaned. Applicant submits that neither of the brackets 15 of Bruhin is adjustably mounted on the jet head 5 (or on the longitudinal section 14) so as to be provided at a required spacing from the other bracket 15 for a particular width of surface 10 to be cleaned.

Adjustable mounting of the second adjustment member is very significant in the field of conveyors for the food industry, where a wide range of conveyor widths can be encountered. Accordingly, a single unit, as specified in claim 22, can be used with a wide range of conveyors, in contrast to the structure shown by Bruhin, where the brackets 15 are a fixed distance apart. In addition, claim 22 specifies that the first and second engagement members are engageable on an item to be cleaned whereas in Bruhin the brackets 15 engage the side walls 17, which are not cleaned by the jet head 5.

In view of the foregoing, applicant submits that the subject matter of claim 22 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, whether taken singly or in combination. Therefore, claim 22 is patentable and it follows that the dependent claims also are patentable.

The examiner has acknowledged that an information disclosure statement was filed on November 16, 2006 but has struck through the information relating to four of the cited foreign-language documents, indicating that those documents have not been considered. The documents in question were cited in the International Search Report and a copy of the International Search Report was included with the items filed upon entry into the national stage. The International Search Report includes an indication of relevance (X, Y or A) of each document and also indicates the passages of the documents that are considered

relevant and the claims to which each document applies. Under MPEP 609.04(a)III, the search report satisfies the requirement under 37 CFR 1.56(c) for a concise explanation of relevance of the foreign-language documents. Applicant therefore requests that the examiner should consider all documents cited in the information disclosure statement, initial the information disclosure statement to confirm that each document has been considered, and return a copy of the information disclosure statement to the undersigned with the next Office Action.

Respectfully submitted,

/John Smith-Hill/

---

John Smith-Hill  
Reg. No. 27,730

SMITH-HILL & BEDELL, P.C.  
16100 N.W. Cornell Road, Suite 220  
Beaverton, Oregon 97006

Tel. (503) 574-3100  
Fax (503) 574-3197

Docket: SWIN 3523